



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/147,770	04/28/1999	PIERO DEL SOLDATO	P8907-9002	2174

7590 12/03/2003

ARENT FOR KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN
1050 Connecticut Avenue N W Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036-5339

EXAMINER

TRAVERS, RUSSELL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2003

35

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/147,770

Applicant(s)

DEL SOLDATO ET AL.

Examiner

Russell Travers, J.D., Ph.D.

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-8 and 11-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 9-10 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,9 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit:

The response filed August 7, 2003 and declaration filed August 7, 2003 have been received and entered into the file.

Applicant's arguments filed September 8, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Claims 1-2, and 6-20 are presented for examination.

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-5 in Paper No. 10 is acknowledged.

Claims 6-8, and 11-20 reading on non-elected subject matter are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-2, 9 and 10 will be examined to the extent they read on the elected subject matter.

This application contains claims 6-8 and 11-20 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 7. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Art Unit:

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Scherrer et al and Matji et al, in view of Persson et al and Chung et al, of record.

Scherrer et al and Matji et al teach those compounds residing in the instant claims 1, 2 as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. These medicaments are taught as useful for treating inflammation. Persson et al and Chung et al teach NO donors as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. Nitric oxide donors are taught by Persson et al and Chung et al as useful for increasing the time to micturition, and increasing bladder pressure threshold. These medicament are taught individually as useful for increasing the time to micturition, and increasing bladder pressure threshold. Compounds taught as useful for increasing the time to micturition, and increasing bladder pressure would have been seen as useful for treating urinary incontinence by the skilled artisan. Claims 1-2 and 5, and the primary references, differ as to:

- 1) the recitation of those medicaments set forth in claims 1, 2,

Art Unit:

The skilled artisan, possessing a compound for a therapeutic use possesses that compounds analogs, homologs, isomers, bioisosteres, salts, acids and esters for the same use. To employ an analog, homolog, isomer, bioisostere, salts acid and ester for the same use therapeutic use would have been obvious to the skilled artisan. Prior art use for the same therapeutic purpose would have motivated the skilled artisan to employ indomethacin esters to the same therapeutic use and enjoy a reasonable expectation of therapeutic success.

It is generally considered prima facie obvious to combine two compounds each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. As shown by the recited teachings, the instant claims define nothing more than the concomitant use of conventional anti-detrusor agents. It would follow that the recited claims define prima facie obvious subject matter. Cf. In re Kerhoven, 626 F.2d 848, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980).

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

Applicants aver unexpected benefits residing in the claimed subject matter, yet fail to set forth evidence substantiating this belief. Evidence as to unexpected benefits must be "clear and convincing" *In re Lohr*, 137 USPQ 548 (CCPA 1963), and be of a scope reasonably commensurate with the scope of the subject matter claimed,

Art Unit:

In re Linder, 173 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1972). The data provided by Applicants is not reasonably commensurate in scope with the instant claims. Absent claims commensurate with the showing of unexpected benefits, or a showing reasonably commensurate with the instant claims, such claims remain properly rejected under 35 USC 103.

It is well known by the skilled artisan that carriers and excipients are employed to enhance the activity of active ingredients. Thus, the skilled artisan would expect conventional excipients and carriers to be useful concomitantly, absent information to the contrary. The instant carriers and excipients are not employed concomitantly in the prior art, thus only obviate their concomitant use.

Applicant's attention is drawn to In re Graf, 145 USPQ 197 (CCPA 1965) and In re Finsterwalder, 168 USPQ 530 (CCPA 1971) where the court ruled that when a substance is unpatentable under 35 USC 103, it is immaterial that applicant may have disclosed an obvious or unobvious further purpose or advantage for the substance.

Examiner would favorably consider claims directed to those medicaments providing unexpected therapeutic benefits, as averred herein.

Applicants declaration filed under 37 CFR 1.132 has been reconsidered, and is found convincing.

As stated above, the instant claims read on analogs, homologs, isomers, bioisosteres, salts, acids and esters known for the same therapeutic use claimed

Art Unit:

herein. The skilled artisan possessing the core compounds for the same therapeutic purpose would have motivated the skilled artisan to employ indomethacin esters to the same therapeutic use enjoying a reasonable expectation of therapeutic success.

Applicant's attention is drawn to In re Dillon, 16 USPQ2d 1897 at 1900 (CAFC 1990). The court sitting in banc ruled that the recitation of a new utility for an old and well known composition does not render that composition new.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory period an additional month upon the filing of a timely first response to a final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY

Art Unit:

PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE
OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Russell
Travers at telephone number (703) 308-4603.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Travers', is positioned above the printed name.

Russell Travers J.D., Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617